ABSTRACT
        A study of the use of and attitudes about language
laboratories focused on teacher perceptions of their speed, accuracy,
and motivational capability and on the extent to which these
characteristics are exploited in classroom use by teachers and
students. Observers in four British schools of English rated details
of language laboratory use in a total of 56 sessions. The laboratory
sessions were rated for their relationship to the criteria job
satisfaction, speed, and accuracy, characteristics assumed to be
advantageous in the language laboratory. It was found that only 13 of
the 56 sessions fully exploited the facilities and that those
sessions had these common features: frequency of use (once a day or
more often), teachers skilled in laboratory use, and well-trained and
responsible students with machines fully under their control. It is
suggested that the language laboratory's use and usefulness are
limited only by the imagination, training, and willingness of the
teacher. (MSE)

EVALUATING THE LANGUAGE LABORATORY IN PRACTICE

Robert Vanderplank (Helsinki University)

1 A model for language laboratory evaluation

1.1 Background

Some time ago I investigated the proposition that the language
laboratory (henceforth, LL) was largely a wasted resource. I wanted
to find out why a valuable educational tool, written about for over
25 years, often at great length, and in use all over the world, was so
poorly regarded by many and rarely seemed to come up to expectations
when put to the test. This work was greeted well by some language
schools in Britain, but on the whole it was received with an embarrassed
silence. I had hoped to raise standards of LL use by attempting to
raise user-consciousness through the evaluation techniques which will
be described below.

The literature on LL evaluation is rather depressing. Most
studies, for example, the Pennsylvania Project (Smith, 1970), the
'communicative competence' study of Savignon (1972), and the York
Study of Green and his associates (Green, 1975) come out against the
LL. A notable early exception is the study of Sarah Lorge (1964),
but on the whole that study remains an exception. Indeed, the last
large-scale study in Britain, the York Study mentioned above, was
particularly damning: that current uses of the LL make it largely a
waste of money.

On the other side, there is a great deal of literature on how to
select a LL, how to manage it, how best to exploit it, its advantages,
and so on. Then there is a third branch which deals with reactions of
teachers: questionnaires, attitude surveys, such as those by Anderson
(1977) in Sweden, and by Holec (1971) in Belgium.

When, early on in my research, I complained about the basic
unfairness of LL comparative studies, since they were loaded against
the LL from the outset by their very design, I was told that there was
no other way. As a convinced LL man who has worked in LL-orientated
environments and is conscious of the benefits it may bring, I could not
accept the findings of many studies in any way other than trivial. If
you reduce your expensive tool to an almost insignificant role, in order
to compare its performance with some thing else, waste much of its
potential and fail to train personnel and make them aware of its poten-
tial, then it seems to me that you are not holding a fair evaluation.

1.2 How the model is made up

I wanted to find a means of evaluating the LL on its own terms in
practice. That is, how this sophisticated, educational tool, with its
own rationale and principles of good use, and with sound pedagogical
reasons to justify its purchase, was actually used by teachers and
learners (leaving aside purely administrative reasons for its use). I

took as my starting point the three basic reasons for the purchase of
any new tool: that it does the job FASTER, BETTER, or gives more USER
SATISFACTION than any other comparable piece of equipment or means of
doing the job. This would mean, in teaching terms, the tape recorder,
a simple form of LL, such as an audio-active LL, or no educational
aids.

How are we to translate these criteria into LL terms? Well,
writers on LL use often talk about the advantages of using the LL. I
looked at the literature and found some 13 given, but there are saven
which all writers agree on:

1. Each learner can answer all the questions and work at the tims.
2. Each learner is responsible for his own performance.
3. Each learner can listen critically to his own ˙ˑeˑ
4. Each learner can work at his own pace.
5. The teacher can deal with each learner's problems   dually.
6. The LL can provide a variety of programmes and act   ˑˑ.
7. Learners are not afraid to speak in the privacy of ˑˑ LL.

How can we link the criteria of FASTER, BETTER, and JOB
SATISFACTION with the proposed or assumed advantages given in the
literature. I would suggest the following:

WORK STUDY CRITERIA	ASSUMED ADVANTAGES
1. Quickness in performing tasks (cutting time/increasing practice time per student)	own pace, answer all questions
2. Accuracy in performing tasks (cutting waste/improving class performance)	listen critically, teacher can help individually
3. Job Satisfaction (using the intelligence of the user as a contributing factor to the above two criteria/ increasing interest and motivation)	responsibility, privacy, variety

You may well suggest that in reality the links are not quite as
neat and clear-cut as I have made them. I would agree entirely, and
this overlapping will be accommodated in another part of the model
which will be described below.

What happens in practice? Of course, the advantages do not come
automatically, although LL salesmen might suggest that they do. Meeting
the criteria and gaining the advantages depend on whether specific
facilities built into the LL are used and also on how they are used.
In other words, the advantages are only realised in practice by the
use of the facilities available and by the fulfilment of specific
conditions regarding the use of the facilities. Let us take, for
example, assumed advantage number 3. Each learner can listen critically
to his own voice. In strictly practical terms, for this assumed
advantage to be obtained, not only must the LL have a record/playback
facility and dual-track tape recorder, but the learner must also be
able to manipulate controls, drills and exercises with ease, independent

3

of the teacher, and have both time and the ability to assess what has been recorded and then correct errors. Moreover, the learner must be aware that the responsibility for the performance is his alone (assumed advantage number 2.).

In more general terms, each assumed advantage can be said to be based on the presence and use of facilities (e.g. cue/rewind, monitor/intercom.) or functions (learner can recap/correct, teacher can listen to learner performance/correct learner), and also on the fulfilment of both pedagogical and technical conditions. The facilities and functions of a normal AAC LL are well-known and I shall not go through them here. As far as pedagogical and technical conditions are concerned, my model includes some thirty in all, some of which are shown below:

Pedagogical conditions of use

LL work should be purpose-designed
Teacher should be trained in exploitation of LL
Objectives of any LL session should be explicit
Amount of LL work should permit learners to work systematically through at own pace
Material should be pre-recorded if administratively possible
Learners must be trained to avoid over- and under-learning
Learners must be trained not to rely on teacher intervention
Students must be trained in use of LL controls
Material used must be adequate and appropriate for the task

Technical conditions of use

Equipment used should be adequate for the task in terms of noise, reliability, clarity
All facilities should be functioning
Material us J should be technically adequate e.g. quality of recording

I think it should be clear by this point that some facilities and functions and their underlying conditions of use can be linked to almost all assumed advantages, while others are more specific. For example, those concerned with self-assessment and correction, and possibly with over- and under-learning can be linked directly with assumed advantage number 3. Each learner can listen critically to his own voice. If we take this point a stage further, we can say that some facilities/functions and conditions have greater bearing on one of the three criteria for LL use: SPEED (S), ACCURACY (A) and JOB SATISFACTION (J), than on the other two. That is, you can weight the use of a facility as an underlying condition with S, A, or J, or with any combination of them. The way this works is shown below in the Operational Model for the analysis and evaluation of LL use.

Let me summarise briefly what I have said so far. My model is built on :
  1. utilization of facilities and functions, and,
  2. fulfilment of conditions underlying their use.
The absence and presence of these conditions and the degree to which any facility or function is exploited act as deciding factors in whether an assumed advantage is obtained in practice in any LL session.

4

OPERATIONAL MODEL FOR ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF LL USE

CRITERION	ADVANTAGE	USE OF FACILITY/FUNCTION or CONDITION OF USE	PRACTICE WEIGHTING
SPEED	1. ANSWER ALL Q'S & WORK ALL TIME	LL WORK PURPOSE-DESIGNED	S/A
		START-UP TIME SHORT	S
		LEARNERS PARTICIPATE IN SESSION	J
		LEARNERS' INTEREST IN SESSION	J
		TEACHER 'HAPPY' USE OF LL	S/A/J
		TEACHER LIKES USING LL	J
		TEACHER EXPERIENCED	S/A
		LL WORK COORDINATED	J
		MATERIAL INDEXED	S
JOB SATISFACTION	2. RESPONSIBLE FOR OWN PERFORMANCE	ALL LEARNERS CLEAR ABOUT OBJECTIVES	S/A/J
		ALL L. 'HAPPY' MANIPULATING DRILLS	S/A/J
		FREQUENT USE OF 'T' CALL	J
		DISCRIMINATING USE OF 'T' CALL	S/A
		PEDAGOGICAL MONITOR	A/J
		INSTRUCTIONAL MONITOR	S/J
		ANALYSIS/DIAGNOSIS OF PRON. ERRORS	S/A/J
		ANAL./DIAG. OF STRUCTURAL ERRORS	S/A/J
ACCURACY	3. LISTEN CRITICALLY TO OWN VOICE	ALL LEARNERS ABLE TO CRITICISE	A/J
		ALL CAPABLE OF SELF-CRITICISM	A
		LEARNERS TEND TO UNDER-LEARN	A
		LEARNERS TEND TO OVER-LEARN	S

CRITERION	ADVANTAGE	USE OF FACILITY/FUNCTION or CONDITION OF USE	PRACTICE WEIGHTING
SPEED	4. WORK AT OWN PACE	ALL LEARNERS 'HAPPY' MECHANICALLY	S/J
		ALL PRE-RECORDED	S/J
		LEARNERS CONTROL DURING SESSION	J
		LEARNERS ABLE TO VARY PACE	S/J
		LEARNERS 'HAPPY' WITH PRE-SET PACE	J
		VARIETY OF PACE	J
ACCURACY	5. TEACHER CAN DEAL WITH INDIVIDUAL LEARNERS	TEACHER MONITORS LEARNERS IN SESSION	A/J
		INDIVIDUAL/GENERAL MONITOR	S/J
JOB SATISFACTION	6. VARIETY OF PROGS. & ACTIVITIES	VARIETY OF MATERIALS	J
		VARIETY OF ACTIVITIES	J
		LL FUNCTIONS EXPLOITED	J
		RECORDED MATERIALS INTEGRATED	S/J
JOB SATISFACTION	7. PRIVACY OF BOOTH	ACOUSTICS/NOISE	J

5

In turn, the absence or presence of the different advantages then indicates whether the LL session can be said to have been held for reasons of SPEED, ACCURACY, or JOB SATISFACTION, none of these, or any combination of them.

2 The model in practice

2:1 Observation grids

The model was adapted to a set of observation grids, four in all. These are shown overleaf. The most important grids for assessing individual LL sessions were <u>Grid 2. Teacher use of LL</u> and <u>Grid 3. Student use of LL</u>.

As can be seen from grids 2 and 3, absence or presence of conditions and use of facilities and functions was not enough. I was also interested in the degree to which equipment was used and functions were carried out. Each scale, therefore, had a set of operational definitions. Some examples of the definitions used are given after the grids. '0' - zero - was always taken to mean 'inapplicable in this session'.

It may all seem rather 'ad hoc' to the informed reader. I should say at this point that I attempted to gain validity for the grids and definitions (which were, in fact, derived entirely from the literature and findings of research on LL use) by distributing questionnaires on LL use to all teachers in the first school studied. The results of these questionnaires supported very strongly the model, the content of the grids and the definitions. It could be claimed, therefore, that teachers were being assessed by the very criteria that they themselves accepted or supported.

2.2 The observations

There were seven observers in four schools of English (including the author). The schools were the School of English Studies, Folkestone, Colchester and Bedford English Study Centres, and the Davies School, Cambridge. Unfortunately, the teacher at the Davies School who was to carry out the observations proved to have neither the knowledge or the experience to carry out the task adquately. It should be clear by this stage that operating this model with any degree of accuracy and reliability does require a sound knowledge and understanding of LL's and considerable experience with them. Thus, even a disappointing observer was, for the purposes of the trial of the model, useful in some respects.

Altogether 56 LL sessions were observed. In each session the observer completed the marking of the grids as the session progressed. Some class information regarding materials, students and the teacher was, of course, known in advance, so grids 2 and 3 could receive most attention. By the end of each session, an observer had gathered a lot of quantitative data on the use of facilities and functions and on the extent to which conditions had been fulfilled. These data could then be grouped according to their bearing on each assumed advantage, using the weighting given to each in terms of S, A and J.

GRID 1 : CLASS DESCRIPTION of class .... with .... at .... on .

LSL. SESSION: circle appropriate alternatives

integrated/supplementary
class mode/library mode
supportive/initial
tape only/multi-media/realia/printed matter
cognitive/manipulative

Learning:	Content of course:
	Objectives:
	Time:
	Frequency:
	Learning environment:
	Material:
	Progressive rigour:
Students:	Socio-cultural:
	Intellect:
	Aptitude: 1. for learning:
	2. for language learning:
	Motivation:
	Level of L2:
Teacher:	Attitude to students:
	Attitude to method:
	Attitude to LL:
	Length of experience with LL:
	Cultural awareness:
	Linguistic and psycholinguistic knowledge
Class:	Number of students:
	Average age: max. age: min. age:
	Class level:
	L 1's
	Use of LL before:

Teacher native speaker/non-native speaker.

Teacher's age:

TEACHER'S USE OF LL DURING SESSION. Circle appropriate number using definition sheet.

T. 'happy' use of LL	5 4 3 2 1 0
T. likes using LL	5 4 3 2 1 0
T. experience in LL use	5 4 3 2 1 0
Objectives of session explicit	5 4 3 2 1 0
Start-up time short	5 4 3 2 1 0
Material induced	5 4 3 2 1 0
LL work co-ordinated with class work	5 4 3 2 1 0
LL work purpose-designed	5 4 3 2 1 0
LL functions exploited	5 4 3 2 1 0
All pre-recorded	5 4 3 2 1 0
Variety of materials	5 4 3 2 1 0
Variety of activities	5 4 3 2 1 0
Variety of pace	5 4 3 2 1 0
Choice of materials	5 4 3 2 1 0
Choice of pace	5 4 3 2 1 0
T. control of pauses	5 4 3 2 1 0
Recorded materials integrated with other materials in LL	5 4 3 2 1 0
teacher monitors students/time	5 4 3 2 1 0
Pedagogical monitoring/time	5 4 3 2 1 0
Instructional monitoring/time	5 4 3 2 1 0
Monitoring from individual to general	5 4 3 2 1 0
Teacher makes notes of student errors	5 4 3 2 1 0
Analysis and diagnosis of student pronunciation errors	5 4 3 2 1 0
Analysis and diagnosis of student structural errors	5 4 3 2 1 0
Teacher feed-in of supplementary materials	5 4 3 2 1 0

7

GRID 3: OBSERVATION OF CLASS ...... with .... at .. on

STUDENT' USE OF LL DURING SESSION. Circle appropriate number using definition sheet

	COMMENTS
All students clear as to pedagogical function of LL	5 4 3 2 1 0
All S. 'happy' manipulatively	5 4 3 2 1 0
All S. 'happy' mechanically	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. want to 'overlearn'	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. want to 'underlearn'	5 4 3 2 1 0
All S. clear as to objectives of session	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. able to vary pace	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. 'happy' with pre-set pace	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. able to self-correct/evaluate	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. capable of self-correcting/evaluating	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. frequent use of T. call	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. discriminating in use of T. call	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. control 100%/time	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. interrupted/time	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. participation/time	5 4 3 2 1 0
S. individualised learning/time	5 4 3 2 1 0

HARDWARE USED IN LL SESSION

Response requirement adequate for task:

T. system:	yes/no
microphone:	yes/no
headset:	yes/no

T. has full remote control: yes/no

'S' stop when T. intercom.: yes/no

Features available: high-speed transfer/simultaneous S & T record/random access revolution counter/loop-repeater/multi-input/multi-programme/two speeds/large reels for spools/pause control/'S' record indicator/writing surfaces/group & conference facilities /

Functions used in LL session:

LL layout: Wall facing/rows with sightlines/rows without sightlines

Noise: yes/no acoustics: good/OK/poor diet: yes/no

Availability of other equipment: easy/difficult

GRID 4: OBSERVATION OF CLASS ...... with .. at . on

MATERIALS USED IN LL SESSION Circle appropriate choice(s)

	COMMENTS
Variety of material available at this level yes/no	
Prepared for LL use/prepared for textbook/multi-purpose	
Published material/in-house material/script/teaching notes	

Production factors:
clarity	good/adequate/poor
intonation	good/adequate/poor
tone	good/adequate/poor
speed	good/adequate/poor
noise	good/adequate/poor
accent	good/adequate/poor
intervals	good/adequate/poor

Recorded materials: 1. exercises/drills

Compatible with other materials	yes/no/unclear
Unambiguous instructions	yes/no/unclear
Str content controlled/graded	yes/no/unclear
Changes from segment to segment controlled/graded	yes/no/unclear
Sufficient examples of str. pattern before change of pattern	yes/no/unclear
Simple correct response	yes/no/unclear
Vocabulary micro-controlled/graded	yes/no/unclear
Sounds well-related to material accompanying	yes/no/unclear
Variety of drill type	yes/no/unclear

2. dialogues for imitation/memorisation/role-playing

Authentic cultural setting	yes/no/unclear
Natural subject matter	yes/no/unclear
Useful phrases for memorisation	yes/no/unclear
Segments for repetition of 'memorable' length	yes/no/unclear
Background noise appropriate	yes/no/unclear

3. other materials used

Is material used at other levels/in other situations	yes/no/unclear
Is hardware present for full exploitation	yes/no/unclear
Is content/time ratio adequate	yes/no/unclear

Differential index: Circle appropriate number on each scale using definition sheet.

discrete	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	- integrated
inflexible	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	flexible
reactive	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	interactive
linear-systematic	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	indexed-selective
T. controlled	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	S controlled
imitative	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	creative
phonetic	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	semantic
structural	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	functional
devised/adapted	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	authentic
skill-based	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	concept-based
habit-based	3 2 1 0 1 2 3	memory-based

Will materials used help meeting teaching objectives in terms of skills, content, grading ? yes/no/unclear

SANCTIONS

TEACHER 'HAPPY' USE OF LL:

5 - TEACHER MAY DISLIKE USING LL OR MAY BE INEXPERIENCED IN ITS USE BUT DEMONSTRATES A MANIPULATIVE AND MECHANICAL SKILL WITH CONTROLS AND FUNCTIONS WHICH INDICATE AN AWARENESS NOT ONLY OF THE MECHANICAL OPERATION OF THE EQUIPMENT BUT ALSO OF ITS INHERENT METHODOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS.

3/4 - NEUTRAL PERFORMANCE, i.e. NO PARTICULAR SYMPATHY BUT APPARENTLY AWARE OF THE NATURE OF THE EQUIPMENT AND APPROPRIATE MANNER OF EXPLOITING IT.

1/2 - TEACHER MAY LIKE USING THE LL AND MAY EVEN BE EXPERIENCED IN ITS USE, BUT DEMONSTRATES AN ABSENCE OF MANIPULATIVE AND MECHANICAL SYMPATHY WITH CONTROLS AND FUNCTIONS WHICH INDICATES A LACK OF AWARENESS NOT ONLY OF THE NATURE OF THE EQUIPMENT, BUT ALSO OF ITS ... METHODOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS

ALL LEARNERS 'HAPPY' MANIPULATIVELY.

5 - LEARNERS ABLE TO PERFORM THE STANDARD VARIETY OF DRILLS AND EXERCISES, e.g. REPETITION, TRANSFORMATION, SUBSTITUTION, etc. AND TO MOVE FROM ACTIVITY TO ACTIVITY WITH MINIMUM LOSS OF CONCENTRATION.

3 - SOME LEARNERS ARE NOT SO 'HAPPY' BUT ANY ABLE TO BENEFIT FROM PRACTICE

1 - LEARNERS DEFINITELY 'UNHAPPY' UNCLEAR AS TO HOW TO PERFORM DRILLS (c.f. TEACHER INSTRUCTIONAL MONITOR-TIME)

INSTRUCTIONAL MONITORING/TIME

5 - 100% of MONITORING TIME
4 - 75%
3 - 50%
2 - 25%
1 - 0%

DEFINITIONS

TEACHER EXPERIENCED IN LL USE:

FREQUENCY X DURATION X LENGTH OF TIME
PER WEEK   FRACTION   MONTHS
           OF HOUR

5 - 100+ VERY EXPERIENCED
4 - 80+ MODERATELY EXPERIENCED
3 - 60+ ADEQUATE EXPERIENCE
2 - 40+ LIMITED EXPERIENCE
1 - 20+ INADEQUATE/INEXPERIENCED

LEARNERS TEND TO UNDER-LEARN

5 - OVER 50% OF LEARNERS HAVE TENDENCY TO RUSH THROUGH EXERCISE AND DRILLS WITHOUT SUFFICIENT ATTENTION TO EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE AND WITH INSUFFICIENT USE OF PAUSE AND REPLAY FACILITIES

3 - SOME LEARNERS; NOT UNDER 50%, UNDER-LEARN AT SOME POINTS IN THE SESSION

1 - FEW, IF ANY, LEARNERS TEND TO UNDER-LEARN AT ANY TIME

LEARNERS ABLE TO VARY PACE

5 - LEARNERS HAVE COMPLETE CONTROL OF PACE OF LEARNING AND PRACTISING THROUGHOUT SESSION

3 - LEARNERS HAVE CONTROL FOR OVER ... OF SESSION e.g. AFTER TRANSFER OF PROGRAMME ...

1 - LEARNERS WORK IN LOCK-STEP THROUGHOUT SESSION

As was said earlier, some conditions or use of facilities/functions have a bearing on all three criteria and so were given equal S,A and J weighting, but at the same time were felt to be more relevant to a single assumed advantage and consequently were attached to that advantage. Since assumed advantages were also given S, A or J criterion, obtaining an assumed advantage establishes whether the respective criterion is being fulfilled, and thus, a qualitative assessment in terms of Speed, Accuracy or Job Satisfaction (i.e. their pedagogical equivalents) is then possible.

The results for eleven out of the fifty-six sessions are shown below (a representative sample). Two of these sessions, 19 and 39, are also given the analysis described above. The analysis shows that the main criterion for holding session 19 appears to have been Job Satisfaction. Of course, in pedagogical terms, without the other criteria, it could well be interpreted as simply giving the learners a change of scene and activity, with no clear pedagogical objectives. In session 39, on the other hand, the Job Satisfaction criterion is linked to the Accuracy criterion, through an emphasis on both accuracy and self-responsibility.

The full results in terms of the three criteria were as follows:

Criteria	Number of sessions
Job Satisfaction/Speed/Accuracy	13
Job Satisfaction/Speed	13
Job Satisfaction/Accuracy	7
Job Satisfaction only	13
Speed/Accuracy	
Accuracy only	0
Speed only	5
None	3
Insufficient data	1

Only thirteen out of fifty-six can be said to have exploited the facilities of the LL fully according to the criteria, and to have gained the advantages of LL use. So, just as the York Study found, the LL really is under-exploited and in these terms is a wasted resource for many. The reasons for the poor showing of so many sessions have been discussed elsewhere (Vanderplank, 1981), but limitations of space means that I can only briefly summarise what the good sessions had in common and what the limiting factors in LL use appear to be from this study.

3 Common features of fully-exploited sessions

The thirteen fully-exploited sessions had the following common features:
- frequency of use (once a day or more)
- ... ers skilled in LL use
- students well-trained and responsible (ll machines fully under their control).

Assumed advantage	Grid conditions	S/A/J	1	2	3	16	17	18	19	20	37	38	39
Each student can answer all q's and work all the time	LL work coordinated		3	5	3	?	4	3	3	2	3	3	5
	T 'happy' use of LL	S/A/J	3	3	5	3	5	3	3	5	4	3	3
	T likes using LL	/J	4	2	2	3	5	4	4	5	4	5	5
	T experience	S/A	5	5	5	3	5	?	5	5	5	5	5
	Mat. indexed	S/	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	0
	Start up time short	S/	4	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	5	5	5
	S interest/time	/J	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
	S participation/time	/J	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
	LL work purpose-designed	S/A	5	5	3	3	4	2	3	4	4	3	5
Each S. responsible for own performance	All S happy manip.	S/A/J	4	2	3	3	4	4	3	5	4	3	5
	All S. clear objectives	S/A/J	4	5	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	5
	Frequent T-call	J	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	1	1
	Discrim. T-call	S/A/J	1	2	2	1	0	1	3	5	5	0	0
	Pedagogical monitor	A/J	2	2	4	1	2	3	2	1	2	4	5
	Anal/diag. pron. errors	S/A/J	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	0	1	3	5
	Anal/diag. str. errors	S/A/J	2	3	3	2	1	2	1	0	1	3	1
	Instructional monitor	S/J	4	4	2	5	2	3	4	3	4	2	1
S can listen constantly to own voice	All S. able crit.	A/J	2	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	5
	All S. capable crit.	A/	2	2	2	4	3	3	3	0	2	2	4
	S. tend underlearn	A/	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	1	3	3	1
	S. tend overlearn	S/	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
S can work at own pace	All S. 'happy' mech.	S/ /J	5	4	4	2	4	3	4	5	1	1	5
	All pre-recorded	S/ /J	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	3	3	5
	S. control/time	J	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	5
	S. able to vary pace	S/ /J	1	1	0	3	4	3	4	3	?	2	0
	S. 'happy' pre-set pace	/J	4	3	3	3	3	4	0	4	2	1	1
	Variety pace	/J	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	4	5	5
T. can deal with individual students	T monitor S./time	A/J	3	5	4	4	4	4	?	2	1	1	
	Individ-general monitor	S/ /J	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3
LL can provide variety of programmes & activities	Rec. mats. integrated	S/ /J	1	2	3	2	4	2	3	3	3	3	1
	Variety of materials	/J	2	1	2	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	1
	Variety of activities	/J	2	1	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
	LL functions exploited	/J	4	3	3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
S can work in privacy of booth	Acoustics/noise	/J	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			

11

SESSION 19

ADVANTAGE 1   J and S weightings predominate
               Advantage obtained

ADVANTAGE 2.   Mixed weightings. The advantage
               is not fully obtained as the teacher
               must spend so much time telling
               some learners what to do.

ADVANTAGE 3.   Many of the class are unable to
               take advantage of the compare
               facility.

ADVANTAGE 4   The advantage gained by pre-recording
               is largely concelled by a monotonous
               pace of work throughout the session,
               with only a short song to break it
               at the end. High motivation shown
               by high 'interest' score.

ADVANTAGE 5.   C.f. Advantage 2. Most communication
               with students is instructional.

ADVANTAGE 6.   Very limited. Advantage not exploited.

ADVANTAGE 7.   Obtained.

CONCLUSIONS: While Advantages 1, 5, and 7 are exploited,
               those concerned with self-criticism (3),
               self-responsibility (R) and variety (4'
               are not. There is a clear predominance
               of Job Satisfaction weightings, which,
               without other weightings and consequent
               advantages could be interpreted as simply
               giving the learners a change of scene and
               activity with no clear pedagogical
               objectives.

SESSION 39

ADVANTAGE 1   Fully exploited. All weightings

ADVANTAGE 2.   Fully exploited. All weightings

ADVANTAGE 3   Adequately exploited 'A'
               weightings predominate

ADVANTAGE 4   Fully exploited. Forty minute
               session. High interest and
               participation values, although
               single pace throughout on tape

ADVANTAGE 5.   Fully exploited. C.f. ADVANTAGE 2
               Pedagogical communication
               encouraging self-criticism and
               self-responsibility

ADVANTAGE 6   Not exploited

ADVANTAGE 7.   Adequate. Cassette hiss.

CONCLUSIONS: All Advantages except Number 6 (Variety)
               exploited. While all weightings are
               Present, emphasis is on accuracy and
               self-responsibility (i.e. Job
               Satisfaction) in this session.

-177-

4 Final comments

I have argued that instead of just comparing the LL with other ways of teaching or learning languages, we need to evaluate how the LL itself is used. I have argued that we can see the rationale behind the LL in terms of three criteria, that it is faster, better, or gives more job satisfaction, and of seven advantages to be gained, potentially), in using the LL.

I would suggest that if the LL is not exploited in such a way as to fulfil the first two criteria, then the user must demonstrate how the LL is suited to the use being made of it in both technological terms and pedagogical terms. The models and grids which I have presented and described do have the potential to raise user-consciousness (especially as for 'er and stude . checklists) through demonstrating clearly where impro. ments can be made. As I found in my studies, it is possible to use the LL fully and well in a very wide variety of ways - not just structural drills, listening exercises, or pronunciation work. In fact, I would say that its uses and usefulness are limited by only two factors: the skills and imagination of the teacher, and the degree of training, preparation and responsibility which the teacher can and is willing to give the learners.

Bibliography

Anderson, A. 1977. "How the language laboratory is used in schools". System 5, 1: 19-26.

Green, P.S.(ed). 1975. The Language Laboratory in School: Performance and Prediction. The York Study. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.

Holec, H. 1971. "Laboratoire et efficacité". Mélanges Pedagogiques 1-17.

Lorge, S.W. 1964. "Language laboratory research studies in New York City High Schools: a discussion of the program and the findings". Modern Language Journal 48, 7: 409-419.

Savignon, S, 1972. Communicative Competence. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, Inc.

Smith, P.D. 1970. A comparison of the cognitive and audio-lingual approaches to foreign language instruction. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.

Vanderplank, R.H. 1981. "Using the language laboratory to develop the listening ability of adult learners of English by means of training in the perception of stress". Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh.